arXiv:1408.0190v1 [math.AG] 1 Aug 2014

On the self-intersection number of the nonsingular models of rational cuspidal plane curves

Keita Tono

Abstract

In this paper, we consider rational cuspidal plane curves having at least three cusps. We give an upper bound of the self-intersection number of the proper transforms of such curves via the minimal embedded resolution of the cusps. For a curve having exactly three cusps, we show that the self-intersection number is equal to the bound if and only if the curve coincides with the quartic curve having three cusps.

1 Introduction

Let C be an algebraic curve on $\mathbf{P}^2 = \mathbf{P}^2(\mathbf{C})$. A singular point of C is said to be a *cusp* if it is a locally irreducible singular point. We say that C is *cuspidal* if C has only cusps as its singular points. Suppose that C is rational and cuspidal. Let C' be the proper transform of C via the minimal embedded resolution of the cusps. Let $(C')^2$ denote its self-intersection number. For instance, $(C')^2 = d$ if C is the rational cuspidal plane curve defined by the equation $x^d = y^{d-1}z$, where $d > 2$ and (x, y, z) are homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbf{P}^2$. We estimate $(C')^2$ in the following way.

Theorem 1. *Let C be a rational cuspidal plane curve with n cusps. If $n \geq 3$, then $(C')^2 \leq 7 - 3n$.*

Remark 1.1. It was proved in [H1, Theorem 3.5] that if Γ is a smooth curve of genus $g \geq 1$ on a smooth rational projective surface S ($S \neq \mathrm{P}^2$ if $g = 1$), then $\Gamma^2 \leq 4g + 4$. From this fact we infer that if C is a cuspidal plane curve of genus $g \geq 1$ with n cusps then $(C')^2 \leq 4g + 4 - 2n$. It was shown in [SST] that for given integers g, n with $g \geq 0$, $1 \leq n \leq 2g + 2$ there exist sequences of cuspidal plane curves C of genus g with n cusps such that $(C')^2 = 4g + 4 - 2n$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14H50

Key words and phrases. plane curve, cusp, self-intersection number.

Supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (22540040) and the Fuujukai Foundation.

Let C be a rational cuspidal plane curve with n cusps. It was proved in [T1] that $n \leq 8$. We denote by $\overline{\kappa} = \overline{\kappa}(\mathbf{P}^2 \setminus C)$ the logarithmic Kodaira dimension of the complement of C. By [W], we see $\overline{\kappa} = 2$ if $n \geq 3$. Moreover, if $n = 2$, then $\overline{\kappa} \geq 0$. If $n = 1$, then it was proved in [Y] that $\overline{\kappa} = -\infty$ if and only if $(C')^2 > -2$. If $n = 2$, then $(C')^2 \leq 0$ by [T3]. From these facts and Theorem 1, $(C')^2$ is bounded from above if $\overline{\kappa} \neq -\infty$.

There are no known examples of rational cuspidal plane curves having more than 4 cusps. There is only one known rational cuspidal plane curve C with 4 cusps. The curve C is a quintic curve with $(C')^2 = -7$ ([N, Theorem 2.3.10]). In [FZ1] (resp. [FZ2], [Fe]), a sequence of rational cuspidal plane curves C of degree d with three cusps was constructed, where $d \geq 4$ (resp. $d = 2k + 3$, $d = 3k + 4$, $k \geq 1$). They satisfy $(C')^2 = 2 - d$ (resp. $(C')^2 = -k - 2$, $(C')^2 = -k - 3$). The bound given by Theorem 1 is the best possible one for the case in which $n = 3$ as the quartic curve C with three cusps satisfies $(C')^2 = -2$. Moreover, we prove the following:

Theorem 2. *Let C be a rational cuspidal plane curve with three cusps. Then $(C')^2 = -2$ if and only if C coincides with the quartic curve having three cusps.*

In [T2], it was proved that the rational cuspidal plane curves C with $n = 1$, $\overline{\kappa} = 2$ and $(C')^2 = -2$ coincide with those constructed by Orevkov in [O]. In [T3], the rational cuspidal plane curves C with $n = 2$, $\overline{\kappa} = 2$ and $(C')^2 = -1$ were classified. Theorem 2 is a similar result for the case in which $n = 3$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we prepare the proof of our theorems.

2.1 Linear chains

Let D be a divisor on a smooth projective surface V. Let $D_1, \ldots, D_r$ be the irreducible components of D. We call D an *SNC-divisor* if D is a reduced effective divisor, each D_i is smooth, $D_i D_j \leq 1$ for distinct D_i, D_j, and $D_i \cap D_j \cap D_k = \varnothing$ for distinct D_i, D_j, D_k. Assume that D is an SNC-divisor. We use the following notation and terminology (cf. [Fu, Section 3] and [MT1, Chapter 1]). A blow-up at a point $P \in D$ is said to be *sprouting* (resp. *subdivisional*) *with respect to* D if P is a smooth point (resp. node) of D. We also use this terminology for the case in which D is a point. By definition, the blow-up is subdivisional in this case.

Assume that each D_i is rational. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma(D)$ denote the dual graph of D. We give the vertex corresponding to a component D_i the weight D_i^2. We sometimes do not distinguish between D and its weighted dual

graph Γ. Assume that Γ is connected and linear. In case where $r > 1$, the weighted linear graph Γ together with a direction from an endpoint to the other is called a *linear chain*. By definition, the empty graph $\varnothing$ and a weighted graph consisting of a single vertex without edges are linear chains. If necessary, renumber $D_1, \ldots, D_r$ so that the direction of the linear chain Γ is from D_1 to D_r and $D_i D_{i+1} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$. We denote Γ by $[-D_1^2, \ldots, -D_r^2]$. We sometimes write Γ as $[D_1, \ldots, D_r]$. The linear chain Γ is called *admissible* if $\Gamma \neq \varnothing$ and $D_i^2 \leq -2$ for each i. We define the *discriminant* $d(\Gamma)$ of Γ as the determinant of the $r \times r$ matrix $(-D_i D_j)$. We set $d(\varnothing) = 1$.

Let $A = [a_1, \ldots, a_r]$ be a linear chain. We use the following notation if $A \neq \varnothing$:

$$ {}^tA := [a_r, \ldots, a_1],\ \overline{A} := [a_2, \ldots, a_r],\ \underline{A} := [a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1}]. $$

The discriminant $d(A)$ has the following properties ([Fu, Lemma 3.6]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $A = [a_1, \ldots, a_r]$ be a linear chain, where $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ are integers.*

(i) If $r > 1$, then $d(A) = a_1 d(\overline{A}) - d(\overline{\overline{A}}) = d({}^tA) = a_r d(\underline{A}) - d(\underline{\underline{A}})$.

(ii) If $r > 1$, then $d(\overline{A})d(\underline{A}) - d(A)d(\underline{\overline{A}}) = 1$.

(iii) If A is admissible, then $\gcd(d(A), d(\overline{A})) = 1$ and $d(A) > d(\overline{A}) > 0$.

Let A be an admissible linear chain. The rational number $e(A) := d(\overline{A})/d(A)$ is called the *inductance* of A. By [Fu, Corollary 3.8], the function e defines a one-to-one correspondence between the set of all the admissible linear chains and the set of rational numbers in the interval $(0, 1)$. For a given admissible linear chain A, the admissible linear chain $A^* := e^{-1}(1 - e({}^tA))$ is called the *adjoint* of A ([Fu, 3.9]). Admissible linear chains and their adjoints have the following properties ([Fu, Corollary 3.7, Proposition 4.7]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let A and B be admissible linear chains.*

(i) If $e(A) + e(B) = 1$, then $d(A) = d(B)$ and $e({}^tA) + e({}^tB) = 1$.

(ii) We have $A^{**} = A$, ${}^t(A^*) = ({}^tA)^*$ and $d(A) = d(A^*) = d(\overline{A^*}) + d(\underline{A})$.

For integers m, n with $n \geq 0$, we define $[m_n] = [\overbrace{m, \ldots, m}^{n}]$, $t_n = [2_n]$. For non-empty linear chains $A = [a_1, \ldots, a_r]$, $B = [b_1, \ldots, b_s]$, we write $A * B = [\underline{A}, a_r + b_1 - 1, \overline{B}]$, $A^{*n} = \overbrace{A * \cdots * A}^{n}$, where $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_r, b_1, \ldots, b_s$ are integers. We remark that $(A * B) * C = A * (B * C)$ for non-empty linear chains A, B and C. By using Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we can show the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A = [a_1 + 1, \ldots, a_r + 1]$ be an admissible linear chain, where $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ are positive integers.*

(i) For a positive integer n, we have $[A, n+1]^* = t_n * A^*$.

(ii) We have $A^* = t_{a_r} * \cdots * t_{a_1}$.

2.2 Vanishing theorem and Zariski decomposition

Let V be a smooth projective surface, K a canonical divisor and $D \neq 0$ a $\mathbf{Q}$-divisor on V. Write D as $D = \sum_{i=1}^{r} q_i D_i$, where $q_i \in \mathbf{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ and all D_i's are distinct irreducible curves. The divisor D is said to be *numerically effective* (*nef*, for short) if $DC \geq 0$ for all curves C on V. We define $\lfloor D \rfloor = \sum_i \lfloor q_i \rfloor D_i$ and $\lceil D \rceil = -\lfloor -D \rfloor$, where $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to q_i. We will use the following vanishing theorem ([Mi], [S2, Theorem 5.1]).

Theorem 3. *Let D be a nef $\mathbf{Q}$-divisor on a smooth projective surface V and K a canonical divisor on V. If $D^2 > 0$, then $h^i(V, K + \lceil D \rceil) = 0$ for $i > 0$.*

We denote by $\mathbf{Q}(D)$ the $\mathbf{Q}$-vector space generated by $D_1, \ldots, D_r$. The divisor D is said to be *contractible* if the intersection form defined on $\mathbf{Q}(D)$ is negative definite ([Fu, Section 6]). The divisor D is said to be *pseudo-effective* if $DH \geq 0$ for all nef divisors H on V. By [Fu, Theorem 6.3], if D is pseudo-effective, then there exists an effective $\mathbf{Q}$-divisor N satisfying the following conditions.

(i) N is contractible if $N \neq 0$.

(ii) $H = D - N$ is nef.

(iii) $HE = 0$ for all irreducible components E of N.

The divisor N is determined by the numerical equivalence class of D by [Fu, Lemma 6.4]. The decomposition $D = H + N$ is called the *Zariski decomposition* of D. The divisor N (resp. H) is called the *negative part* (resp. *nef part*) of D.

From now on, we assume that V and D satisfy the following conditions.

(Z1) $D \neq 0$ is an SNC-divisor such that $K + D$ is pseudo-effective.

(Z2) Each (-1)-curve $E \leq D$ satisfies $(D - E)E > 2$ or, $(D - E)E = 2$ and E intersects only a single irreducible component of D.

Following [Fu, MT1], we use the following terminology. The divisor D is said to be *rational* if each D_i is rational. Let $0 < T = \sum_{j=1}^{t} T_j \leq D$ be a divisor, where T_j's are irreducible. The divisor T is called a *twig* of D if $(D - T_1)T_1 = 1$, $(D - T_j)T_j = 2$ and $T_{j-1}T_j = 1$ for $j \geq 2$. Suppose that T is

a rational twig of D. The twig T is said to be *admissible* if $T_j^2 < -1$ for all j. We infer under the assumption (Z2) that a rational twig is contractible if and only if it is admissible. There exists an irreducible component D_i of D such that $T_t D_i = 1$ and $D_i \nleq T$. The rational twig T is said to be *maximal* if D_i is not rational or $(D - D_i)D_i > 2$. Suppose that the twig T is rational and contractible. The element $\mathrm{Bk}(T) \in \mathbf{Q}(T)$ satisfying $\mathrm{Bk}(T)T_j = (K + D)T_j$ for all j is called the *bark* of T.

Let B be a connected component of D. The divisor B is called a *rod* if the dual graph $\Gamma(B)$ of B is linear. The divisor B is called a *rational fork* if it satisfies the following conditions.

(i) $B = C + T^{(1)} + T^{(2)} + T^{(3)}$ is rational, where $T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}, T^{(3)}$ are contractible maximal rational twigs of D and C is an irreducible curve such that $(B - C)C = 3$.

(ii) $(K + B - \Sigma_i \mathrm{Bk}(T^{(i)}))C < 0$.

Suppose that B is a rational rod or a rational fork. Suppose also that B is contractible. The element $\mathrm{Bk}(B) \in \mathbf{Q}(B)$ satisfying $\mathrm{Bk}(B)E = (K + B)E$ for all irreducible components E of B is called the *bark* of B. Let $B_1, B_2, \ldots$ be the all rational rods and rational forks which are contractible. Let $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ denote the all rational maximal twigs which are contractible and not contained in any B_i. The divisor $\mathrm{Bk}(D) = \sum_i \mathrm{Bk}(B_i) + \sum_j \mathrm{Bk}(T_j)$ is called the *bark* of D.

Let N denote the negative part of $K+D$. We will use the following facts. See [Fu, Section 6] and [MT1, Chapter 1]. Note that rods (resp. rational forks) are called *clubs* (resp. *abnormal rational clubs*) in [Fu, Section 6]. The divisor $\mathrm{Bk}(D)$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Bk}^*(D)$ and called the *thicker bark* of D.

Lemma 2.4. *The following assertions hold under the assumptions (Z1), (Z2).*

(i) All rational rods, rational forks and rational twigs of D belong to $\mathbf{Q}(N)$. In particular, they are contractible.

(ii) If $N \neq \mathrm{Bk}(D)$ and any connected component of D is not a rational rod, then there exists a (-1)-curve $E \subset \mathrm{Supp}(N)$ such that $DE \leq 1$ and $E \nleq D$. Moreover, E meets with $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{Bk}(D))$ if $DE = 1$.

Proof. (i) By [Fu, Lemma 6.13], all rational rods and rational twigs of D belong to $\mathbf{Q}(N)$. Let B be a rational fork. Write B as $B = C + T^{(1)} + T^{(2)} + T^{(3)}$ as in the definition of rational forks. Since $(N - \Sigma_i \mathrm{Bk}(T^{(i)}))C \leq (K + D - \Sigma_i \mathrm{Bk}(T^{(i)}))C < 0$, we have $C \in \mathbf{Q}(N)$ by [Fu, Lemma 6.15]. Hence $B \in \mathbf{Q}(N)$.

(ii) We note that all rational twigs are admissible by (i) and (Z2). Thus the assertion follows from [Fu, Lemma 6.20]. See also Section 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 of [MT1]. □

Lemma 2.5. *In addition to the assumptions (Z1), (Z2), suppose that* $N = \mathrm{Bk}(D)$, $\overline{\kappa}(V \setminus D) = 2$ *and that every rational rod and rational fork of* D *contains an irreducible component* E *with* $E^2 < -2$. *Then the following assertions hold.*

(i) $\lfloor N \rfloor = 0$.

(ii) $h^1(V, 2K + D) = h^2(V, 2K + D) = 0$.

(iii) $h^0(V, 2K + D) = K(K + D) + D(K + D)/2 + \chi(\mathcal{O}_V)$.

Proof. We have $\lfloor N \rfloor = \lfloor \mathrm{Bk}(D) \rfloor = 0$ by [MT1, Section 1.4 and Lemma 1.5] and the assumption. Since $\overline{\kappa}(V \setminus D) = 2$, we see $H^2 > 0$ by [K]. We apply Theorem 3 to H. We have $0 = h^i(V, K + \lceil H \rceil) = h^i(V, 2K + D + \lceil -N \rceil) = h^i(V, 2K + D)$ for $i = 1, 2$. The last equality follows from the Riemann-Roch formula. □

2.3 The bigenus of Q-homology planes

Let V be a smooth projective surface, K a canonical divisor and $D \neq 0$ an SNC-divisor on V. Suppose that $X := V \setminus D$ is a $\mathbf{Q}$-homology plane. That is, $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \{0\}$ for $i > 0$. In this section, we compute the *bigenus* $h^0(V, 2K + D)$ of X ([S1]). We will use the following facts ([Fu, Corollary 2.5, Theorem 2.8], [H2, Theorem II.4.2] and [MT2, Main Theorem]).

Lemma 2.6. *The following assertions hold,*

(i) X *is affine.*

(ii) $h^1(V, \mathcal{O}_V) = h^2(V, \mathcal{O}_V) = 0$.

(iii) $\Gamma(D)$ *is a connected rational tree.*

(iv) D *is not contractible.*

(v) If $\overline{\kappa}(X) = 2$, *then* X *does not contain topologically contractible algebraic curves.*

From now on, we assume that V and D satisfy the following conditions.

(H1) $\overline{\kappa}(X) = 2$.

(H2) All (-1)-curves $E \leq D$ satisfy $(D - E)E > 2$.

Note that V, D satisfy the conditions (Z1), (Z2) in Section 2.2. Let $K + D = H + N$ be the Zariski decomposition, where N is the negative part of $K + D$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let* V, D *be as above satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2). Then the following assertions hold.*

(i) *D is neither a rational rod nor a rational fork.*

(ii) *We have $N = \mathrm{Bk}(D)$, $\lfloor N \rfloor = 0$.*

(iii) *We have $h^1(V, 2K + D) = h^2(V, 2K + D) = 0$, $h^0(V, 2K + D) = K(K + D)$.*

Proof. The divisor D is neither a rational rod nor a rational fork by Lemma 2.4 (i) and Lemma 2.6 (iv). Suppose $N \neq \mathrm{Bk}(D)$. By the assertion (i) and Lemma 2.4 (ii), there exists a (-1)-curve $E \not\leq D$ such that $DE \leq 1$, which contradicts Lemma 2.6 (i), (v). We have $\chi(\mathcal{O}_V) = 1$, $D(K + D) = -2$ by Lemma 2.6 (ii), (iii). Thus the remaining assertions follow from Lemma 2.5. □

We will use the following lemma to show Theorem 2.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\varphi : V \to W$ be the composition of successive blow-ups over a smooth projective surface W and $D \neq 0$ an SNC-divisor on V. Let $P \in W$ be the center of the first blow-up of φ and E the exceptional curve of the last blow-up over P. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied.*

(1) $V \setminus D$ is a $\mathbf{Q}$-homology plane with $\overline{\kappa}(V \setminus D) = 2$.

(2) $E \not\leq D$.

Then the following assertions hold.

(i) *At least two locally irreducible branches of $\varphi(D)$ pass through P.*

(ii) *Suppose that exactly two locally irreducible branches D_1, D_2 of $\varphi(D)$ pass through P. Suppose also that D_1, D_2 intersect each other at P transversally. Let D_1', D_2' denote the proper transforms of D_1, D_2 via φ, respectively. Then the dual graph of $D_1' + \varphi^{-1}(P) + D_2'$ has the following shape, where $0 \leq T_1, T_2 \leq D$ may be empty.*



Proof. It is enough to show the assertions for the case in which all blow-ups of φ are done over P.

(i) By Lemma 2.6 (iv), $\varphi(D)$ is not a point (cf. [Mu]). Let D' denote the proper transform of $\varphi(D)$ via φ. The divisor $T := \varphi^{-1}(P)$ is an SNC-divisor. The dual graph of T is a connected tree. If $P \notin \varphi(D)$, then $T \subset V \setminus D$, which contradicts the fact that $V \setminus D$ is affine. Thus $P \in \varphi(D)$. Suppose that there is only one locally irreducible branch of $\varphi(D)$ which passes through P. Then $T \cap D'$ consists of a single point Q.

We see $T \neq E$ since $E \setminus D$ is not topologically contractible by Lemma 2.6. Suppose that $T_0 := T - E$ does not intersect D'. Then D' intersects only

$E \not\leq D$ among the irreducible components of T. Since D is connected, we have $T_0 \subset V \setminus D$, which is absurd. Hence $T_0 \cap D' = \{Q\}$. We note that E may pass through Q. If $T_0 E = 1$, then $E \cap D = \varnothing$ or $E \cap D = \{\text{one point}\}$, which contradicts Lemma 2.6. Thus $T_0 E \geq 2$ and T_0 is not connected. Let T_1 be a connected component of T_0 which does not passes through Q. Then T_1 intersects only $E \not\leq D$ among the irreducible components of $T - T_1$. This means that $T_1 \subset V \setminus D$, which is impossible.

(ii) It follows from (i) that the dual graph of $D_1' + \varphi^{-1}(P) + D_2'$ is linear. Suppose that there exists an irreducible component E' of $\varphi^{-1}(P) - E$ such that $E' \not\leq D$. If $E \cap E' \neq \varnothing$, then $DE = 1$, which contradicts Lemma 2.6. Thus $E \cap E' = \varnothing$. Then $D_1' + \varphi^{-1}(P) + D_2' - E - E'$ is not connected. Since D is connected, $V \setminus D$ contains a connected component of $D_1' + \varphi^{-1}(P) + D_2' - E - E'$, which is impossible. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

Let C be a rational cuspidal plane curve and $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ the cusps of C. We will use the fact that $\mathbf{P}^2 \setminus C$ is a $\mathbf{Q}$-homology plane. Let $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ be the composition of a shortest sequence of blow-ups such that the reduced total transform $D := \sigma^{-1}(C)$ is an SNC-divisor. Let C' be the proper transform of C. For each k, the dual graph of $\sigma^{-1}(P_k) + C'$ has the following shape.



Here $D_0^{(k)}$ is the exceptional curve of the last blow-up over P_k and $h_k \geq 1$. By definition, $A_1^{(k)}$ contains the exceptional curve of the first blow-up over P_k. The morphism σ contracts $A_{h_k}^{(k)} + D_0^{(k)} + B_{h_k}^{(k)}$ to a (-1)-curve E, $A_{h_k-1}^{(k)} + E + B_{h_k-1}^{(k)}$ to a (-1)-curve, and so on. The self-intersection number of every irreducible component of $A_i^{(k)}$ and $B_i^{(k)}$ is less than -1 for each i. See [BK, MaSa] for detail.

We give the graphs $A_1^{(k)}, \ldots, A_{h_k}^{(k)}$ (resp. $B_1^{(k)}, \ldots, B_{h_k}^{(k)}$) the direction from the left-hand side to the right (resp. from the bottom to the top) in the above figure. We assign each vertex the self-intersection number of the corresponding curve as its weight. With these directions and weights, we regard $A_i^{(k)}$ and $B_i^{(k)}$ as linear chains. See Section 2.1.

We may assume $\sigma = \sigma^{(n)} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma^{(1)}$, where $\sigma^{(k)}$ is the composition of the blow-ups over P_k of σ. There exists a decomposition $\sigma^{(k)} = \sigma_0^{(k)} \circ \sigma_1^{(k)} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{h_k}^{(k)}$ such that $\sigma_i^{(k)}$ contracts $[A_i^{(k)}, 1, B_i^{(k)}]$ to a (-1)-curve for each $i \geq 1$.

Let $\eta_i^{(k)}$ denote the number of the sprouting blow-ups of $\sigma_i^{(k)}$ with respect to the (-1)-curve. We will use the following lemma ([T2, Propositon 12]).

Lemma 3.1. *We have* $A_i^{(k)} = t_{\eta_i^{(k)}} * B_i^{(k)*}$, $A_i^{(k)*} = [B_i^{(k)}, \eta_i^{(k)} + 1]$ *for each* i, k. *In particular,* $A_i^{(k)}$ *contains an irreducible component* E *such that* $E^2 < -2$.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let K be a canonical divisor on V. Let ω_k (resp. η_k) denote the number of the subdivisional (resp. sprouting) blow-ups of σ over P_k, where the blow-up at P_k is regarded as a subdivisional one. We have $\eta_k = \sum_{i=1}^{h_k} \eta_i^{(k)}$ and $\omega_k + \eta_k =$ the number of the blow-ups of $\sigma^{(k)}$. We complete the proof of Theorem 1 by showing the following proposition. We note that $\overline{\kappa} = 2$ if $n \geq 3$ by [W].

Proposition 3.2. *If* $\overline{\kappa} = 2$, *then* $0 \leq K(K+D) = 7 - 2n - (C')^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \eta_k$. *Moreover, we have* $(C')^2 \leq 7 - 3n$.

Proof. We have $K(K+D) = 7 - D^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n}(\omega_k + \eta_k)$. It was proved in [MaSa, Lemma 4] that $D^2 = (C')^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n}(\omega_k - 2)$. Thus we get $K(K+D) = 7 - 2n - (C')^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \eta_k$. The surface $V \setminus D$ is a $\mathbf{Q}$-homology plane satisfying the conditions (H1), (H2) in Section 2.3. By Proposition 2.7, we have $0 \leq K(K+D)$. The second blow-up of σ over P_k is a sprouting one for each k. This fact shows the last inequality. □

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Assume that $n = 3$ and $(C')^2 = -2$. By [W], we have $\overline{\kappa} = 2$. By Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, we get the following:

Lemma 3.3. *The following assertions hold for each* k.

(i) $h_k = 1$ *and* $\eta_1^{(k)} = 1$.

(ii) $A_1^{(k)} = t_1 * B_1^{(k)*}$ *and* $A_1^{(k)*} = [B_1^{(k)}, 2]$.

Let $\sigma' : V \to V'$ be the contraction of $D_0^{(2)}$ and $D_0^{(3)}$. Since $\sigma'(C')^2 = 0$, there exists a $\mathbf{P}^1$-fibration $p' : V' \to \mathbf{P}^1$ such that $\sigma'(C')$ is a nonsingular fiber. Put $p = p' \circ \sigma' : V \to \mathbf{P}^1$. On V, there are two irreducible components of $A_1^{(k)} + B_1^{(k)}$ meeting with $D_0^{(k)}$ for each k. One of them must be a (-2)-curve and the other must not. Let $D_1^{(k)}$ be the (-2)-curve and let $D_2^{(k)}$ be the remaining one. Put $S_1 = D_0^{(1)}$, $S_2 = D_2^{(2)}$, $S_3 = D_2^{(3)}$, $S_4 = D_1^{(2)}$ and $S_5 = D_1^{(3)}$. The curves $S_1, \ldots, S_5$ are 1-sections of p. Namely, the

intersection number of them and a fiber is equal to one. The divisor D contains no other sections of p. The divisor $F_0' := C' + D_0^{(2)} + D_0^{(3)}$ is a singular fiber of p.

The surface $X = V \setminus D$ is a $\mathbf{Q}$-homology plane. A general fiber of $p|_X$ is isomorphic to a curve $\mathbf{C}^{(4*)} = \mathbf{P}^1 \setminus \{5 \text{ points}\}$. Cf. [MiSu]. There exists a birational morphism $\varphi : V \to \Sigma_d$ from V onto the Hirzebruch surface Σ_d for some $d \geq 0$. The morphism φ is the composition of the successive contractions of the (-1)-curves in the singular fibers of p, and $p \circ \varphi^{-1} : \Sigma_d \to \mathbf{P}^1$ is a $\mathbf{P}^1$-bundle.

Lemma 3.4. *We may assume that $\varphi(S_1+S_2+S_3)$ is smooth. The following assertions hold.*

(i) $\varphi(S_1) \sim \varphi(S_2) \sim \varphi(S_3)$ *(linearly equivalent),* $d = \varphi(S_1)^2 = 0$.

(ii) We have $\varphi(F_0') = \varphi(C')$. The fiber $\varphi(F_0')$ passes through $\varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_4)$ and $\varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_5)$.

(iii) φ contains exactly one blow-up over $\varphi(S_1)$. The set $\varphi(S_1) \cap \varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of a single point, which coincides with the center of the blow-up.

(iv) $\varphi(S_4)^2 = \varphi(S_5)^2 = \varphi(S_4)\varphi(S_5) = 2$, $\varphi(S_4)\varphi(S_1) = \varphi(S_5)\varphi(S_1) = 1$.

Proof. By [T3, Lemma 17], we may assume that $\varphi(S_1 + S_2 + S_3)$ is smooth. We have $\varphi(S_1) \sim \varphi(S_2) \sim \varphi(S_3)$ and $\varphi(S_1)^2 = 0$. If φ contracts C', then $\varphi(S_1 + S_2 + S_3)$ must be singular. Thus $\varphi(F_0') = \varphi(C')$ and φ contracts $D_0^{(2)} + D_0^{(3)}$. Hence $\varphi(F_0')$ passes through $\varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_4)$ and $\varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_5)$.

For $i = 4, 5$, put $\varepsilon_i = \varphi(S_i)\varphi(S_1)$. We have $\varphi(S_i)^2 = 2\varepsilon_i$ because $\varphi(S_i) \sim \varphi(S_1) + (\text{a fiber of } p \circ \varphi^{-1})\varepsilon_i$. Since $\varphi(S_i)$ intersects $\varphi(S_{i-2})$, we see $\varepsilon_i > 0$. Because $S_1^2 = -1$, φ contains exactly one blow-up over $\varphi(S_1)$. This means that $\varepsilon_4 = \varepsilon_5 = 1$ and that $\varphi(S_1) \cap \varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5) \neq \varnothing$. We have $\varphi(S_4)\varphi(S_5) = \varepsilon_4 + \varepsilon_5 = 2$. The remaining assertions are clear. □

We use Lemma 3.4 to show the following:

Lemma 3.5. *The following assertions hold.*

(i) For $i = 4, 5$, φ contains exactly four blow-ups over $\varphi(S_i)$. The centers of the blow-ups must be the points of intersection of $\varphi(S_i)$ and the other sections $\varphi(S_j)$ $(j \neq i)$.

(ii) If a fiber F of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ intersects $\varphi(S_1 + \cdots + S_5)$ in five points, then the proper transform F' of F via φ is not a component of D and intersects $D_0^{(1)}$, $D_1^{(2)}$ and $D_1^{(3)}$.

Proof. The first assertion of (i) follows from the fact that $S_i^2 = -2$ and $\varphi(S_i)^2 = 2$. The second follows from Lemma 3.4 and the fact that S_i does not intersect the other sections on V. By (i) and Lemma 3.4 (iii), φ does not perform blow-ups over $F \cap \varphi(S_1 + S_4 + S_5)$. This means that F' intersects $D_0^{(1)}$, $D_1^{(2)}$ and $D_1^{(3)}$. Since the dual graph of D contains no loops, F' is not a component of D. □

By Lemma 3.4, $\varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ and $\varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_4)$ consist of a single point, respectively.

Lemma 3.6. *The two points $\varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_5)$, $\varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_4)$ are on a single fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary. Let F_2 (resp. F_3) denote the fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ passing through $\varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ (resp. $\varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_4)$). Let F_i' denote the proper transform of F_i via φ for $i = 2, 3$. By Lemma 3.4 (iii), F_i' intersects S_1. It follows from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 (i) that F_i' intersects $D_1^{(i)}$. Since the dual graph of D does not contain loops, F_i' is not a component of D.

Suppose that $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of one point. Let F be the fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ passing through $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$. By Lemma 3.5 (ii), the proper transform via φ of every fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ other than F and $\varphi(F_0')$ is not a component of D. This contradicts the fact that there are three irreducible components of $D - D_0^{(1)}$ meeting with $D_0^{(1)}$, each of which is contained in a fiber of p. Hence $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of two points.

Let E be the exceptional curve of the blow-up of φ at $\varphi(S_1) \cap \varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$. By Lemma 3.4 (iii) and Lemma 3.5 (i), the proper transform E' of E by φ intersects S_1, S_4 and S_5. Thus E' is not a component of D. By the same argument as above, there are at most two components of $D - D_0^{(1)}$ meeting with $D_0^{(1)}$, which is absurd. □

By Lemma 3.4 (iv), the set $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of one or two points.

Lemma 3.7. *If $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of two points, then* $\deg C = 4$.

Proof. We show $\sigma^{-1}(P_k) = D_0^{(k)} + D_1^{(k)} + D_2^{(k)}$ for each k. Put $\{Q_1\} = \varphi(S_1) \cap \varphi(S_5)$, $\{Q_2\} = \varphi(S_2) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ and $\{Q_3\} = \varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5) \setminus \{Q_1\}$. For each i, let F_i be the fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ passing through Q_i. Put $\{Q_4\} = \varphi(S_3) \cap \varphi(S_4)$. The fiber F_2 passes through Q_4 by Lemma 3.6. Since $S_1, \ldots, S_5$ do not intersect each other, φ performs blow-ups at all Q_i's. Let E_i be the exceptional curve of the blow-up at Q_i. We sometimes use the same symbols to denote the proper transforms of E_i, $\varphi(S_i)$, etc. via blow-ups. Let F_i' denote the proper transform of F_i via φ.

By Lemma 3.4 (iii) and Lemma 3.5 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups at $E_1 \cap \varphi(S_1)$, $E_1 \cap \varphi(S_4)$ and $E_1 \cap \varphi(S_5)$ after the blow-up at Q_1. This

means that E_1 intersects S_1, S_4 and S_5 on V. Thus E_1 is not a component of D. It follows from Lemma 2.8 (i) that φ does not perform blow-ups over E_1. By Lemma 3.5 (ii), the proper transforms via φ of the fibers of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ other than $\varphi(F'_0)$, F_1, F_2 and F_3 are not contained in D. By Lemma 3.4 (iii), φ does not perform blow-ups over $\varphi(S_1) \setminus \{Q_1\}$. Thus F'_2 and F'_3 are contained in D and intersect $S_1 = D_0^{(1)}$. It follows that $F_2 + F_3$ coincides with the image of $D_1^{(1)} + D_2^{(1)}$ under φ. We have $(F'_3)^2 < -2$ since φ performs blow-ups at Q_3, $\varphi(S_2) \cap F_3$ and $\varphi(S_3) \cap F_3$. Hence $F'_2 = D_1^{(1)}$ and $F'_3 = D_2^{(1)}$.

Since $(F'_2)^2 = -2$, φ only performs two blow-ups over F_2. The centers coincide with Q_2 and Q_4. The curve E_4 is not a component of D because it intersects $S_4 = D_1^{(2)}$ and $F'_2 = D_1^{(1)}$ on V. By Lemma 2.8 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups over E_4. Similarly, E_2 is not a component of D and φ does not perform blow-ups over E_2. It follows that $D_1^{(1)}$ intersects only $D_0^{(1)}$ among the components of $D - D_1^{(1)}$. Hence $(F'_3)^2 = (D_2^{(1)})^2 = -3$.

We see that φ does not perform blow-ups over $F_3 \setminus (\varphi(S_2 + S_3) \cup \{Q_3\})$. By Lemma 3.5 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups at $E_3 \cap \varphi(S_4)$ and $E_3 \cap \varphi(S_5)$ after the blow-up at Q_3. Thus E_3 intersects F'_3, S_4 and S_5 on V. Hence E_3 is not a component of D. It follows that $S_{i+2} = D_1^{(i)}$ intersects only $D_0^{(i)}$ among the components of $D - D_1^{(i)}$ for $i = 2, 3$. Hence $S_i^2 = (D_2^{(i)})^2 = -3$.

For $i = 2, 3$, let $E_{3,i}$ be the exceptional curve of the blow-up at $F_3 \cap \varphi(S_i)$. Since $S_i^2 = (F'_3)^2 = -3$, φ does not perform blow-ups at $E_{3,i} \cap \varphi(S_i)$ and $E_{3,i} \cap F_3$ after the blow-up at $F_3 \cap \varphi(S_i)$. This means that $E_{3,i}$ intersects $F'_3 = D_2^{(1)}$ and $S_i = D_2^{(i)}$ on V. Thus $E_{3,i}$ is not a component of D. Hence $D_2^{(1)}$ intersects only $D_0^{(1)}$ among the components of $D - D_2^{(1)}$. Since $S_i^2 = -3$, φ does not perform blow-ups at $F_1 \cap \varphi(S_2)$ and $F_1 \cap \varphi(S_3)$. Thus F'_1 is not a component of D. Hence $D_2^{(i)}$ intersects only $D_0^{(i)}$ among the components of $D - D_2^{(i)}$. □

From now on, we assume that $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ consists of one point. We prove that the assumption causes a contradiction. Let F_1 (resp. F_2) be the fiber of $p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ passing through $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ (resp. $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_3)$). For each i, put $T_i = \varphi^{-1}(F_i)$. Let b_i be the number of the irreducible components of T_i which are not contained in D.

Lemma 3.8. *The fibration p has exactly three singular fibers F'_0, T_1, T_2. We have $b_1 + b_2 = 6$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 2.8 that p has exactly three singular fibers F'_0, T_1, T_2. Let $\rho(V)$ denote the Picard number of V and $r(D)$ the number of the irreducible components of D. We have $\rho(V) = r(D)$. The number of the blow-ups of φ is equal to $r(D) + b_1 + b_2 -$(the number of the sections in D)$-$(the number of the singular fibers). Thus $r(D) = \rho(V) = \rho(\Sigma_d) + r(D) + b_1 + b_2 - 8$. □



(1) $E_{12}, F_1 \not\leq D$, $E_{11} \leq D$, $b_1 = 2$

(2) $E_{12}, X_{11}, X_{12} \not\leq D$, $E_{11}, F_1, T_{1i}, U_{1i} \leq D$, $F_1^2 \leq -3$, $b_1 = 3$

(3) $\{S, S'\} = \{S_2, S_3\}$, $E_{12}, X_{11}, X_{12} \not\leq D$, $E_{11}, F_1, T_{1i}, U_{1i} \leq D$, $E_{11}^2 \leq -3$, $F_1^2 \leq -3$, $b_1 = 3$

Figure 1: The weighted dual graph of $T_1 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$

The next lemma describes the structure of the fibration p.

Lemma 3.9. *We may assume that the weighted dual graph of $T_1 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ (resp. $T_2 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$) coincides with that in Figure 1 (2) (resp. Figure 2 (2)). The weighted dual graph of $\sigma^{-1}(P_2)$ coincides with that in Figure 3. In the figures, $*$ (resp. $\bullet$) denotes a (-1)-curve (resp. (-2)-curve).*

Proof. We first show that the weighted dual graph of $T_1 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with one of those in Figure 1. Let E_{ij} be the exceptional curve of the j-th blow-up φ_{ij} of φ over F_i for $i = 1, 2$. We use the same symbols to denote the proper transforms of E_{ij}, $\varphi(S_j)$, etc. via blow-ups. Since $S_4 = D_1^{(2)}$ and $S_5 = D_1^{(3)}$ do not intersect each other, we may assume that the centers of φ_{11} and φ_{12} are $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$.

By Lemma 3.5 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups at $E_{12} \cap \varphi(S_4)$ and $E_{12} \cap \varphi(S_5)$. This means that E_{12} intersects $S_4 = D_1^{(2)}$ and $S_5 = D_1^{(3)}$ on V. Thus $E_{12} \not\leq D$. By Lemma 2.8 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups over E_{12}. By Lemma 3.4 (iii), E_{11} and F_2 intersect S_1 on V. Let E be an irreducible components of a fiber of p which meets with $D_0^{(1)}$. It follows from Lemma 3.5 (ii) that E is not a component of D if $E \neq C', E_{11}, F_2$. Since three irreducible components of $D - D_0^{(1)}$ meet with $D_0^{(1)}$, the curves



(1) $E_{21}, E_{22} \not\leq D$, $F_2 \leq D$, $b_2 = 2$



(2) $E_{21}, X_{21}, X_{22} \not\leq D$, $E_{22}, F_2, T_{2i}, U_{2i} \leq D$, $F_2^2 \leq -3$, $E_{22}^2 \leq -3$, $b_2 = 3$



(3) $E_{22}, X_{21}, X_{22} \not\leq D$, $E_{21}, F_2, T_{2i}, U_{2i} \leq D$, $F_2^2 \leq -3$, $E_{21}^2 \leq -3$, $b_2 = 3$



(4) $X_{2i} \not\leq D$, $E_{21}, E_{22}, F_2, T_{2i}, U_{2i} \leq D$,
$F_2^2 \leq -4$, $E_{21}^2 \leq -3$, $E_{22}^2 \leq -3$, $b_2 = 4$

Figure 2: The weighted dual graph of $T_2 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$



Figure 3: The weighted dual graph of $\sigma^{-1}(P_2)$

E_{11}, F_2 must be components of D. By Lemma 2.8 (i), φ does not perform blow-ups over $E_{11} \setminus F_1$.

Suppose $F_1 \not\leq D$. By Lemma 2.8 (i), φ does not perform further blow-ups over F_1. We have $E_{11} = D_1^{(1)}$. The weighted dual graph of $T_1 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with (1) in this case. Suppose $F_1 \leq D$. Since D does not contain loops, φ performs blow-ups at two or three points of the three points $F_1 \cap (E_{11} + \varphi(S_2 + S_3))$. If the latter case occurs, then it follows from Lemma 2.8 (ii) that D is not connected, which is absurd. Thus the former case must occur. It follows from Lemma 2.8 (ii) that the weighted dual graph of $T_1 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with (2) (resp. (3)) if φ does not perform (resp. performs) a blow-up at $F_1 \cap E_{11}$.

We next show that the weighted dual graph of $T_2 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with one of those in Figure 2. By Lemma 3.5 (i), we may assume that the center of φ_{21} (resp. φ_{22}) is $\varphi(S_4) \cap F_2$ (resp. $\varphi(S_5) \cap F_2$). Furthermore, φ does not perform blow-ups at $\varphi(S_4) \cap E_{21}$ and $\varphi(S_5) \cap E_{22}$. If φ does not perform blow-ups over F_2 further, then the weighted dual graph of $T_2 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with (1). We have $E_{21}, E_{22} \not\leq D$ in this case.

Suppose that φ performs blow-ups over F_2 further. If φ does not perform blow-ups over E_{21}, then E_{21} intersects $S_3 = D_2^{(3)}$ and $S_4 = D_1^{(2)}$ on V. Thus $E_{21} \not\leq D$. If φ performs a blow-up over E_{21}, then it must be done over $E_{21} \cap \varphi(S_3)$ or $E_{21} \cap F_2$ by Lemma 2.8 (i). Moreover, we have $E_{21} \leq D$. Since D contains no loops, it must be done over both of $E_{21} \cap \varphi(S_3)$ and $E_{21} \cap F_2$. Similar arguments are valid for E_{22}. If φ performs blow-ups over both of E_{21} and E_{22}, then the weighted dual graph of $T_2 + S_1 + \cdots + S_5$ coincides with (4). Otherwise it coincides with (2) or (3).

Now we show that the weighted dual graph of $\sigma^{-1}(P_2)$ coincides with that in Figure 3. We say that p is of type (i-j) if T_1 (resp. T_2) coincides with (i) in Figure 1 (resp. (j) in Figure 2). We prove that p is of type (2–2) or (2–3). By Lemma 3.8, p must be of type (1–4), (2–2), (2–3), (3–2) or (3–3). Suppose p is of type (1–4). We have $A_1^{(1)} = [F_2, \ldots]$ and $B_1^{(1)} = [2]$. By Lemma 3.3, $A_1^{(1)} = [B_1^{(1)}, 2]^* = [3]$. This contradicts the fact that $F_2^2 \leq -4$ on V. Suppose p is of type (3–2) or (3–3). In this case, we have $\{D_1^{(1)}, D_2^{(1)}\} = \{E_{11}, F_2\}$. But $E_{11}^2 \leq -3$ and $F_2^2 \leq -3$, which contradicts $(D_1^{(1)})^2 = -2$. By changing the roles of P_2 and P_3, if necessary, we may assume that p is of type (2–2). It follows that the weighted dual graph of $\sigma^{-1}(P_2)$ coincides with that in Figure 3. □

We can arrange the order of the blow-ups of φ such that $\varphi = \varphi_0 \circ \varphi_{11} \circ \varphi_{12} \circ \varphi_{22} \circ \varphi_{21}$. Here φ_{ij} contracts $T_{ij} + X_{ij} + U_{ij}$ to a point in Figure 1 (2) and Figure 2 (2). The morphism φ_0 contracts $E_{11} + E_{12} + E_{21} + E_{22} + D_0^{(2)} + D_0^{(3)}$ to points. We use the same symbols to denote the proper transforms of $\varphi(C')$, $\varphi(S_j)$, etc. via blow-ups. The morphism φ_0 performs the blow-ups at $\varphi(C') \cap \varphi(S_2)$ and $F_2 \cap \varphi(S_2)$. The morphism φ_{11} performs the blow-up at

$F_1 \cap \varphi(S_2)$ and φ_{22} performs the blow-up at $E_{22} \cap \varphi(S_2)$. Thus $S_2^2 \leq -4$. By Lemma 3.9, we have $A_1^{(2)} = [\ldots, -S_2^2]$ and $B_1^{(2)} = [2]$. By Lemma 3.3, we see $A_1^{(2)} = t_1 * B_1^{(2)*} = [3]$. Hence $S_2^2 = -3$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\varphi(S_4) \cap \varphi(S_5)$ must consist of two points. We have completed the proof of Theorem 2.

References

[BK] Brieskorn, E., Knörrer, H.: Plane algebraic curves. Basel, Boston, Stuttgart: Birkhäuser 1986.

[Fe] Fenske, T.: Rational cuspidal plane curves of type $(d, d-4)$ with $\chi(\Theta_V\langle D\rangle) \leq 0$, Manuscripta Math. **98** (1999), 511–527.

[Fu] Fujita, T.: On the topology of non-complete algebraic surfaces, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **29** (1982), 503–566.

[FZ1] Flenner, H., Zaidenberg, M.: On a class of rational cuspidal plane curves, Manuscripta Math. **89** (1996), 439–459.

[FZ2] Flenner, H., Zaidenberg, M.: Rational cuspidal plane curves of type $(d, d-3)$, Math. Nachr. **210** (2000), 93–110.

[H1] Hartshorne, R.: Curves with high self-intersection on algebraic surfaces, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. **36** (1969), 111–125.

[H2] Hartshorne, R.: Ample subvarieties of algebraic varieties, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 156. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer 1970.

[K] Kawamata, Y.: On the classification of non-complete algebraic surfaces, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 732. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer 1979, 215–232.

[MaSa] Matsuoka, T., Sakai, F.: The degree of rational cuspidal curves, Math. Ann. **285** (1989), 233–247.

[MiSu] Miyanishi, M., Sugie, T.: $\mathbf{Q}$–homology planes with $\mathbf{C}^{**}$-fibrations, Osaka J. Math. **28** (1991), 1–26.

[MT1] Miyanishi, M., Tsunoda, S.: Non–complete algebraic surfaces with logarithmic Kodaira dimension $-\infty$ and with non–connected boundaries at infinity, Japan. J. Math. **10** (1984), 195–242.

[MT2] Miyanishi, M., Tsunoda, S.: Absence of the affine lines on the homology planes of general type, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **32** (1992), 443–450.

[Mi] Miyaoka, Y.: On the Mumford-Ramanujam vanishing theorem on a surface, Journées de géométrie algébrique d'Angres, (1979), 239–247, Alphen aan den Rijn: Sijthoff and Nordroff 1980.

[Mu] Mumford, D.: The topology of normal singularities of an algebraic surface and a criterion for simplicity, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. **9** (1961), 5–22.

[N] Namba, M.: Geometry of projective algebraic curves, New York, Basel: Dekker 1984.

[O] Orevkov, S. Yu.: On rational cuspidal curves I. Sharp estimate for degree via multiplicities, Math. Ann. **324** (2002), 657–673.

[S1] Sakai, F.: Kodaira dimensions of complements of divisors, Complex Analysis and Algebraic Geometry, Iwanami and Cambridge Univ. Press, (1977), 239–257.

[S2] Sakai, F.: Weil divisors on normal surfaces, Duke Math. J. **51** (1984), 877–887.

[SST] Sakai, F. and Saleem, M. and Tono, K.: Hyperelliptic plane curves of type $(d, d-2)$, Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie **51** (2010), 31–44.

[T1] Tono, K.: On the number of cusps of cuspidal plane curves, Math. Nachr. **278** (2005), 216-221.

[T2] Tono, K.: On Orevkov's rational cuspidal plane curves, J. Math. Soc. Japan **64** (2012), 365–385.

[T3] Tono, K.: On a new class of rational cuspidal plane curves with two cusps, Preprint. arXiv:1205.1248

[W] Wakabayashi, I.: On the logarithmic Kodaira dimension of the complement of a curve in $\mathbf{P}^2$, Proc. Japan Acad. **54**, Ser. A (1978), 157–162.

[Y] Yoshihara, H.: Rational curves with one cusp (in Japanese), Sugaku **40** (1988), 269–271.

E-mail address: ktono@rimath.saitama-u.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saitama University, Saitama-City, Saitama 338–8570, Japan.